

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

ALEXANDRA LOZANO, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**Civil Action 2:22-cv-3089
Chief Judge Algenon L. Marbley
Magistrate Judge Kimberly A. Jolson**

JOHN DOES I–X, et al.,

Defendants,

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs’ failure to name Defendants to this action. Plaintiffs are immigration attorneys who bring this suit against unknown Defendants, whom they say engaged in a defamation campaign against them on various internet platforms. (Doc. 2, ¶¶ 1–5, 10–72). Previously, the Court granted Plaintiffs leave to serve expedited discovery to: (1) request from the internet platforms only the identifying information of users who reported their content, left false reviews, and created imposter accounts; and (2) engage in depositions of individuals suspected of being involved in the campaign, but only to determine the extent of those individuals’ knowledge regarding the defamatory campaign, and their knowledge of the defamers’ identities. (Doc. 5 at 3). Plaintiffs then sought to expand the expedited discovery to allow for document requests, which the Court denied without prejudice, noting that Plaintiffs must first use the mechanisms available to them to name some Defendants, so that their interests could also be considered by the Court. (Doc. 10 at 2).

At the time of that ruling, Plaintiffs had served at least two subpoenas for depositions, which were each the subject of motions to quash in other courts. (Doc. 9 at 4). On November 7, 2022, District Judge James L. Robart denied one such motion to quash. *Lozano v. John Does I–X*,

No. 2:22-cv-01477-JLR, Doc. 11 (W.D. Wash.). And, on November 9, 2022, District Judge Fernando Rodriguez, Jr. denied the other. *Scarborough v. Lozano*, 1:22-mc-00100, Doc. 8 (S.D. Tex.). Accordingly, it would appear Plaintiffs have had sufficient time to conduct depositions and identify some Defendants.

Plaintiffs are **ORDERED** to name Defendants to this action—or otherwise show cause as to their inability to do so—within **fourteen days** of the date of this Order. Failure to do so may result in a recommendation that this case be dismissed for want of prosecution.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: March 10, 2023

/s/ Kimberly A. Jolson
KIMBERLY A. JOLSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE